



An Analysis of Illocutionary Speech Acts in the Book “Paparaton: Legenda Ken Arok dan Ken Dedes”

Rochmat Budi Santosa*

Abstract

This study aims at finding out how the Searle’s illocutionary speech acts are most frequently used and performed in the book “Paparaton: Legenda Ken Arok dan Ken Dedes”. The researcher uses qualitative method by collecting data from reading the book, analyzing the dialogues of each characters, reading the script and doing library research. The total of the classification illocutionary speech acts according to Searle are 39 speech acts. The result of analysis shows that there are 9 commissives of illocutionary speech acts (23%). There are 9 representatives of illocutionary speech acts (23%). There are 7 expressive of illocutionary speech acts (18%). There are 14 directives of illocutionary speech acts (38%). It is not found declaration of illocutionary acts in this book. The study also reveals the importance of illocutionary speech acts in keeping the flow of storyline of the book. This study expected to give some useful insights in understanding what illocutionary speech acts.

Keywords: *Speech acts, Paparaton “Legenda Ken Dedes dan Ken Arok”, Dialogue, Qualitative*

A. INTRODUCTION

Exactly a century ago, in 1885, the linguist and archaeologist J. L. A. Brandes began with the study of indigenous sources for the reconstruction of the Javanese past. Because of his spadework in this field he is now regarded as the father of Javanese historiographical studies as an academic

discipline. As a government servant charged with the study of the Old Javanese language and of archaeology, Brandes was interested first and foremost in the history of the pre-Muslim past. When he began his studies, texts like the *Pararaton* and the *Nagarakertagama*, which we today regard as indispensable tools for the study of the Majapahit period in Javanese history, were not yet available, however. He himself was to discover them and make them accessible to an interested public by way of text editions (Brandes 1897V19202; 1904).

Brandes' successor in the study of the *babad* literature was Hoessein Djajadiningrat. In his Ph.D. thesis concerning the *Sejarah Banten* (Djajadiningrat 1913), he gave ample attention to the *Babad Tanah Jawi*. His merit was that he tried to unravel the genesis of the *Babad Tanah Jawi* without resorting to a general theory concerning the genre to which this book is, rightly or wrongly, believed to belong. He observed that the part of the text dealing with the earliest period of the realm of Mataram contains predictions of events and situations which were to take place much later, namely after the fall of the kraton of Plered in 1677. This imparted to these stories a special relevance for those parts of the text that deal with this much later period. It was the function of these predictions to provide a justification for dynastic irregularities occurring at a much later point in history. The implication of this is that it will be possible to determine the time of writing of particular passages on the basis of their purpose.

Berg had published on related subjects prior to that (Berg 1938, 1951). Like Djajadiningrat and De Graaf, Berg believed that the core of the *Babad Tanah Jawi* took shape during the reign of Sultan Agung. But he contested their view, which followed in Brandes' footsteps, that the advent of Islam and subsequent fall of Majapahit caused a break in the cultural development of Java. Berg denied that there had been a bloody religious war which caused the fall of Majapahit and, together with it, the destruction of the Old Javanese literary heritage. Brandes did not recognize the fact - Berg argued - that the *Babad Tanah Jawi* is based on the *Pararaton* as regards its representation of the remote past, and posited instead a discontinuity in Javanese historiography. Berg assumed that Sultan Agung's court poet, as a younger colleague of the Majapahit court poet Prapanca, wrote the *Babad Tanah Jawi* by reference to a Middle Javanese tradition and compiled it basically from Middle Javanese materials. In Central Java a story concerning the rulers of Singhasari and Majapahit had survived, together with the notion that for a dynastic history the so-called 'two-house structure' is typical. The implication of this is

that the Babad Tanah Jawi placed the royal house of Mataram in a specific relation vis-a-vis an older lineage, and that this relation, as far as its characteristic details are concerned, resembles the relation in which the Pararaton places the royal house of Majapahit vis-a-vis that of Singhasari. This principle plus other material handed down by tradition were used by Sultan Agung's court poet, as a practitioner of literary magic, to lay a magic foundation for a prosperous reign. Consequently the form of the Babad Tanah Jawi is determined by Sultan Agung's interests. What Berg objects to in Brandes' theory is that it has the Babad Tanah Jawi spring from an inadequate allogeneous prototype, namely a supposed hand-book for poets. De Graaf, on the other hand, assumes the existence of an adequate prototype, a Surabayan chronicle. But hereby he fails to realize that a new cultural element always requires the previous existence of an allogeneous phenomenon. Berg indicates the combination Nagarakertagama-Pararaton as the original model for the Babad Tanah Jawi. As a prototype it is both allogeneous and adequate. He further expresses the opinion that it can be proved from the structure of the genealogy contained in the Babad Tanah Jawi that in the 17th century not Panembahan Senapati but Sultan Agung was regarded as the founder of the Mataram dynasty.

The story in a text, including in literature, may also be examined in a variety of disciplines, including pragmatics. Within pragmatics a text may also be examined from different points of view, including the theory of speech acts, which was originally developed by Austin (1962). The theory explains how speakers use utterances to perform intended actions and how hearers interpret intended meaning from what is said. As Searle (1969: 42) puts it, "all linguistic communication involves linguistic acts". This is to say that there is an act in every communication that people perform.

Theoretically, speech act concerns how an act is performed by means of language. Speech act is best defined as "in saying something, we do something" (Austin, 1962: 12). Searle further systematizes five speech act categories that are still relevant to the Austin's theory as the result of the revision. They are assertive, directives, commissives, expressives and declaratives.

Modern linguistics refers to as the study of language as a system of human communication. A main observation is that language can be used not only to describe the reality but also to change the existing reality. In simple words, it can be asserted 'to speak is to act'. Linguistics act that intend to influence the reality is commonly called Speech Acts. Kees

(1992:153) states when people speak, they do not only transfer information in a technical sense but also convey their attention. For example, “this room is very hot”. This utterance can be gathering into three meaning, first meaning expresses an utterance like the example (literal meaning), the second meaning s/he intend to inform other people that the room is very hot and try to convey an intention. Perhaps, asking someone to open the window, door or complain about the room. Thus, Speech Acts is the common study of pragmatics and each utterance/conversation has a meaning.

Using rules to define speech act seems inappropriate because it tends to be grammatical instead of pragmatic descriptions (Thomas 1995). Aziz (2000) argued that a speech act will not be effective if any reactions do not come from interlocutors. Thus, a corresponding attitude on the part of the hearer is more important than rules to determine successfulness of a speech act performance. Bach and Harnish (1979) paid attention to this important aspect. They theorized speech acts based on the speaker’s expressed attitudes which form the hearer’s corresponding attitudes. The corresponding attitudes are derived from hearer’s inferential process toward the speaker’s attitudes. The inferential process is comprehensively described in a speech act schema (SAS). The SAS, as their influential contribution, has made a clear pattern of inference done by the hearer. A product of the SAS is the taxonomy of communicative illocutionary acts. It is a classification of speech acts which categorizes speech acts into four kinds (Constatives, Directives, Commisives, Acknowledgments). The classification is used to categorize speech acts realized in the readers’ forum due to its detail and comprehensiveness. Besides, it seems reasonable to prefer the expressed attitudes-based speech acts theory since the rules-based theory brings lots of weaknesses.

According to Searle (1969), Speech Acts is observed on what the speaker says when due to communication. Searle (1969) states that when we communicate each other, we do not only produce symbols, words and sentences which do not have meanings but also have some meanings. Moreover, Searle (2011) categorizes the illocutionary acts or types of Speech Acts into representatives, directives, commissive, expressive, and declaration. It can be concluded that illocutionary act often occurs in doing communication because the speaker and hearer come from different cultural background, so the ways of communication are different.

The objective of this study is to find out how the Searle’s illocutionary speech acts are most frequently used and performed in the book

“*Paparaton: Legenda Ken Arok dan Ken Dedes*”. This research uses a descriptive qualitative method. The source of data is the dialogue in the book of “*Kitab Paparaton: Legenda Ken Arok dan Ken Dedes*.”

B. RESEARCH METHOD

The researcher used a qualitative method which means the researcher collected qualitative data and interpreted data qualitatively. Different types of references such as books, journal articles, encyclopedia, were consulted to get relevant scientific information to support the research. Information retrieval through the Internet was also conducted to retrieve the relevant articles or references. The data for this research was taken from the script that the writer retrieved from the book. The data was analyzed by using speech acts theories of Searle comprising representatives, directives, commissive, expressive, and declaration.

The data needed for this research is illocutionary speech acts used in the communication or social interaction. Because this research does not need any questionnaire, the data were obtained by reading the book *Paparaton: Legenda Ken Arok Dan Ken Dedes*. The researcher tried to understand each of the dialogues and figured out the illocutionary speech acts performed in this book. The researcher only took the dialogues that contain speech acts in this book. The dialogue that contains speech acts marked and identified in terms of kind of the speech acts performed in the dialogue. The data obtained from this research were then analyzed based on the Searle’s theory. The book consists of 90 pages, there are some chapters and we only took four chapters randomly.

C. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

From the data collection, the researcher found four kinds of illocutionary speech act; commissives, representatives, expressive, and directives.

Table. 1 Analyze Speech Acts

No	Types of Speech Acts	Speaker	Addresse	Total	Percentage
1	Commissive	Adoptive parents	Ken Arok	9	23 %
		Raden Wijaya	Wiraraja		
		Tohjaya	Lembu Ampal		
		Sang Arya	Gajah Mada		
		Gajah Mada	Sang Arya		
		Mpu Purwo	The person who abducts his daughter		
		Mpu Gandring	Ken Arok		
		Someone who has an authority in some territory named Kapundungan	The villagers that come to his farm		
		Ken Arok	The chief of Bapa's territory		
2	Representative	Wiraraja	Raden Wijaya	9	23 %
		Lembu Ampal	The people of Rajasa and Sinelir rebelling to the Apanji Tohjaya		
		Mpu Purwa	Anusapati		
		Nurse	Anusapati		
		Nurse	Anusapati		
		Ken Dedes	Anusapati		
		Ken Arok	Mpu Gandring		
		Ken Dedes	Anusapati		
		Raja Jaya Katog	Adjundant		

3	Expressive	Raja Jaya Katog	Adjundant	7	18 %
		Lembu Ampel	Noble		
		Gajah Mada	King Arya		
		Kebo Mundarang	Raden Wijaya		
		Sora	Raden Wijaya		
		Sang Dang Hyang	Ken Arok		
		Kebo Mundarang	Raden Wijaya		
3	Directive	Raja Jaya Katog	Raden Wijaya	14	38 %
		Sora	Raden Wijaya		
		Sora	Raden Wijaya		
		Sang Brahmana	Two knights		
		Nurse	Anusapati		
		Sang Bango Sam-paran	Ken Arok		
		Mpu Palot	Ken Arok		
		Ken Arok	Mpu Palot		
		Raden Wijaya	Sora		
		Sora	Raden Wijaya		
		The chief of the village	Ken Arok		
		Dewa Brahma	KenEndok		
		Teacher	Ken Arok		
		Ken Arok	Teacher		

Based the table, the total of the classification illocutionary speech acts according Searle are 39 speech acts. The result of analysis shows that there are 9 commissive of illocutionary speech acts, so the percentage is 23%. There are 9 representatives of illocutionary speech acts, so the percentage is 23%. There are 7 expressive of illocutionary speech acts, so the percentage is 18%. There are 14 directives of illocutionary speech acts, so the percentage is 38%. The researcher didn't find declaration in this book.

The formula of the percentage is:

$$\frac{\text{Total Types of Illocutionary} \times 100\%}{\text{Total Illocutionary Speech Act}}$$

1. Commissive

- ✓ “Anakku kami bersedia menjadi hamba tanggungan, asalkan engkau tidak pergi. Kami akan menjalani menjadi budak tanggungan yang dipertuankan di Lebak.” (my son, we would humbly be as a maid, unless you go. Let us become maid in Lebak).

Explanation: This conversation included as commissive, commissive is a speech act understood by speakers to bind the action for the future. The conversation occurs between Lembong (adoptive parents) and Ken Arok. Ken Arok takes care of buffalos, and then the buffalos lost. The buffalos belong to the masters of the Lebak. Then, the Masters of Lebak pay eighth thousand for the buffalos. Finally, Ken Arok is scolded by his parents. His parents want to be a servant, with the requisite that Ken Arok will not leave.

- ✓ Kata Raden Wijaya, “*Bapa Wiraraja, sangat besar utangku kepadamu. Jika itu tercapai tujuanku, akan kubagi tanah Jawa menjadi dua nanti. Hendaknya engkau menikmati setengahnya, aku setengahnya.*” (Mr. Wiraraja, I owe a huge thing at you. If I achieve my goal, I will share the Javanese land into two, you get a half, and so for me)

Begitulah janji Raden Wijaya kepada Wiraraja.

Kata Wiraja, “*Bagaimana kehendak tuanku saja, asalkan tuanku dapat menjadi raja.*” (whatever you are, so you become the king)

Explanation: The speaker is Raden Wijaya and the listener is Wiraraja. Speaker promises to listener. If Raden Wijaya could get the authority in Java Island, Wiraraja would give the half of it. This conversation is a commissive speech act, especially a promise.

- ✓ *Jika engkau tidak berhasil membunuh dua ksatria itu, maka engkau sendiri yang akan aku kulenyapkan.* Kata Tohjaya kepada Lembu Ampal. (If you can not kill those two knights, I will kill you myself)

Explanation: The setting is about the order from Apanji Tohjaya to Lembu Ampal for killing the two knights, they are Mahisa Cempaka and Ranggawuni. If Lembu Ampal is failed, then Apanji Tohjaya himself will kill him.

- ✓ Sang Arya berkata kepada Gjah Mada “*Nak, aku akan membantu*

dalam segala kesulitan dan dalam masalah-masalah yang luar biasa.” (I will help you at any occasion and for any serious obstacles).

Explanation: The conversation is commissive illocutionary act that is promising. Here Sang Arya promises to help Gajah Mada to solve the problem.

- ✓ Gajah Mada berkata, “ Jika pulau-pulau di luar Majapahit sudah kalah, aku akan istirahat. Nanti kalau sudah kalah Gurun, Seran, Tanjung Pura, Haru, Phang, Dampo, Bali, Sunda, Palembang, Tumasak, barulah aku meikmati masa istirahat.” (Gajah Mada said, “ If the islands outside Majapahit conquered, and so do Gurun, Seran, Tanjung Pura, Haru, Phang, Dampo, Bali, Sunda, Palembang, Tumasak, then I retire.”)

Explanation: The situation was when Gajah Mada became the governor in Mangkubumi but he didn’t want to take a rest to conquer the other places under Majapahit command.

This can be as the commissive illocutionary which tells about Gajah Mada promising about Majapahit wealth as long as he lives.

- ✓ Mpu Purwo pun menjatuhkan **kutukan dan sumpah yang tak baik**, “semoga yang melarikan anakku tidak akan lanjut menyenjam kenikmatan! **Semoga ia ditusuk keris dan diambil istrinya!** Demikian juga orang-orang di Panawijen ini, semoga tempat mengambil air menjadi kering! **Semoga tak keluar air kolamnya ini karena tak mau memberitahu bahwa anakku dilarikan dengan paksa.**” Mpu Purwapun menyebutkan “Adapun anakku yang menyebabkan gairah dan bercahaya terang, **ku kutuk semoga ia mendapatkan keselamatan dan kebahagiaan besar.**”

Explanation: In this statement Mpu Purwo gave deprecation and swear to the person who abducted his daughter. The statement related to swear is included in commissive (speech act).

- ✓ Mpu Gandring berkata: Hei Ken Arok, kelak engkau akan mati oleh keris itu. Anak cucumu akan mati karena keris itu juga. Tujuh raja akan mati karena itu. Setelah itu, Empu Gandring meninggal. (Mpu Gandring said: Hi Ken Arok, You will be killed by this

keris, so will your descendants, seven kings will be murdered by it)

Explanation: This statement shows that Mpu Gandring was angry with Ken Arok, he swore that Ken Arok will die because of that Keris, and so will his descendants.

- ✓ Yang di pertuankan di Kapundungan menjawab, “Tuan-tuan, kami tidak bohong. Ia tidak ada di sini. Anak kami berjumlah enam orang. Yang sedang bertanam ini genap enam orang. Cobalah kalian hitung sendiri. Jika lebih dari enam orang, tentu ada orang lain disini.”

Explanation: From the utterance, there is someone who has an authority in some territory named Kapundungan. Some villagers said there is a rioter come to his farm. The utterance can be categorized into commissive illocutionary, because the chief of the village have told to the villager and give the guarantee that there is no rioter in his farm.

- ✓ Kata Ken Arok, “Kalau aku kelak menjadi orang, aku akan memberi perak kepada yang dipertuankan di daerah Bapa ini,” (Ken Arok said, “If I get success, I will give the lords of this land silvers)

Explanation: From the utterance, it is shown that Ken Arok was promising that he will give bullion to the chief of Bapa’s territory. Bapa is the other name of Turyatapada. It is because Ken Arok feels obliged to Mpu Palot. That’s why the utterance categories into commissive illocutionary.

2. Representative

- ✓ Di situ Arya Wiraraja berkata,” *Tuanku, hamba mengambil muslihat. Hendaknya pergi mengamba kepada Raja Jaya Katog. Hendaknya tuan seakan-akan meminta maaf dengan kata-kata yang mengandung arti tunduk. Jika sekira-kira Raja Jaya Katog tak keberatan, hendaknya tuan lekas pindah bertempat tinggal di Daha.*” (Your majesty, I made a trick. You’d better come to king Raja Katong as if you asked for apologies. You’d allso better move to Daha if he doesn’t mind).

Explanation: The speaker is Wiraraja and the listener is Raden Wijaya. Speaker gives suggestion to listener. The situation is Wiraraja gave suggestion to Raden Wijaya to make approach with Raja

Jaya Katog, it means the Daha's palace would be under Raden Wijaya's authority easily. This conversation is representative, especially suggestion.

- ✓ Kemudian setelah mendamaikan kedua belah pihak Lembu Ampal berpesan kepada orang Rajasa dan sinelir, "Nanti sore hendaknya kalian datang ke sini. Bawalah teman-teman kalian. Hendaknya kalian siap memberontak dan menyerbu istana." (You shall come here with your friends this evening. Be ready to attack the palace).

Explanation: The situation is about the effort of Lembu Ampal to break the families who stay under the royal command, then ask them to rebell the royal family.

The conversation underlined above tells about the representative. That is announcement, because here Lembu Ampal announces to the people of Rajasa and Sinelir to rebell Apanji Tohjaya.

- ✓ "Dandang Gendhis, yang bernama Mahisa Walungan, *gugur sebagai pahlawan*. Bersama-sama dengan menterinya yang perwira bernama Gubar Baleman." (Dandang Gendis named Mahisa Walungan was dead as a hero, also his minister Gubar Baleman)

Explanation: The statement above is representative because it is explain news.

- ✓ "Sesudah Ken Arok menang terhadap musuh, *lalu* pulang ke Tuma-pel. Dikuasailah tanah Jawa olehnya. Ia sebagai raja *telah berhasil* mengalahkan Daha pada tahun 1144 Saka." (Ken Arok triumphed and came back to Tumapel. He ruled Java. He conquered Daha in 1144 saka).

"Lama-kelamaan tersiar berita bahwa sang Anusapati, anak Tunggal Ametung, bertanya-tanya kepada pengasuhnya." (it is finally known that Anusapati, Tunggul Ametung's son, seek for information to his maid.)

Explanation: Similar with the utterance above, the statement above is a representative because it gives news.

- ✓ "*Hamba takut terhadap Ayah tuan,*" begitu kata pengasuh itu. ("I am really afraid of your Father," the maid said.)

Explanation: The statement above is representative because it explains that someone feels fear.

- ✓ Jawab Ken Dedes, “*Rupa-rupanya* telah ada rasa tidak percaya padamu, Nak.” (Ken Dedes answered, “It seems you don’t trust me, Son.”).

Explanation: The statement is representative illocutionary because it is about prediction, the word is “*rupa-rupanya*”

- ✓ Kata Ken Arok, manakah pesanan hamba kepada tuan Gangring? Mpu menjawab yang sedang aku asah ini, ananda Arok. Ken Arok meminta keris pesannya untuk dilihatnya. Katanya dengan agak marah “ahh tidak ada gunanya aku menyuruh kepada tuan Gandring ini, **bukankah belum selesai diasah keris itu? Memang celaka? Inikah rupanya yang tuan kerjakan selama 5 bulan ini?**

Explanation: in this statement Ken Arok complain about the Keris which he ordered, Mpu Gndring broke the promise.

- ✓ Ken Dedes pun kemudian menjawab, “Sang *Amurwabumi* yang membunuhnya, Nak.” (Ken Dedes answered, “Amurwabumi killed him, Son.”)

Explanation: The statement tells about murder, so it includes representative speech act (reporting, give the information to someone)

- ✓ Jawab Ken Dedes, “*Rupa-rupanya* telah ada rasa tidak percaya padamu, Nak.” (Ken Dedes answered, “It seems you don’t trust me, Son.”)

Explanation: The statement is representative illocutionary because it is about prediction; the fact word is “*rupa-rupanya*”

3. Expressive

- ✓ Kata Raja Jaya Katong, “*Mengapa kami tidak senang jika buyung Arsa Wijaya akan tunduk kepada kami?*” (King Raja Katong said, “Why

don't we feel happy if Arsa Wijaya will come with us)

Explanation: The speaker is Raja Jaya Katong and the listener is an aide. The aide delivered the letter from Raden Wijaya, and then Raja Jaya Katong answered the conversation. The situation happens in Daha's palace when the aide gave the letter to Raja Jaya Katong from Raden Wijaya. This part includes speech act of expression, especially welcoming.

- ✓ Lembu Ampal menghadap kedua bangsawan itu. Kemudian berkatalah Lembu Ampal kepada kedua bangsawan itu, "Hamba ber-lindung kepada tuan hamba. Dosa hamba adalah disuruh melenyapkan tuan oleh Batara Apanji Tohjaya. Sekarang hamba minta di sumpah jika tuan tidak percaya agar hamba dapat menghamba paduka dengan tentram."

Explanation: This setting took place when Apanji Tohjaya knew about Lembu Ampal's failure to kill the two knights. Then, the king wanted to kill Lembu Ampal too. Lembu Ampal choose to help the two knights and become their slave. This conversation become an illocutionary acts of expressive.

- ✓ Gajah Mada berkata, "Ananda tidak sanggup jika menjadi patih sekarang ini. Jika sudah kembali dari Sadeng, hamba bersedia menjadi patih. Itu pun jika tuan sudi memaafkan segala kekurangan kemampuan ananda ini." (Gajah Mada said, "I could not be a governor at present. I would be eager if I have came back from Sadeng. Thus, please forgive me).

Explanation: The situation tells about Gajah Mada's pardon about his unreadiness to become the governor for his king Sang Arya. This illocutionary act is about Expressive that shows about apology and permission about his journey to Sadeng.

- ✓ Ia mundur seraya berkata, "Aduh, memang *sunngguh dewalah tu-an ku ini.*"

Explanation: The utterance is included as expressive illocutionary, because the utterance tells about praising.

- ✓ Kata Sora, “Sekarang ini, tuan *hendaknya* menyerang. Sekarang adalah kesempatan yang baik.” (Soraya said, “now, you shall make a raid. It is the time)

Explanation: From the utterance, it can be categorized into directive illocutionary because the utterance is kind of recommending.

- ✓ Ken Arok diam, akhirnya dia berkata, Bapa Dang Hyang, perempuan yang bercahaya rahasianya itu adalah istri sang Akuwu Tumapel. Jika demikian, aku akan membunuh sang Akuwu pasti mati ditanganku jika bapa mengizinkan.

Jawab Sang Dang Hyang, “ya tentu matilah Tunggul Ametung olehmu anakku. **Hanya saja aku tak pantas memberimu izin. Karena itu, bukan tindakan seorang pendeta. Batasnya adalah kehendak sendiri.**

Explanation: In this conversation, Sang Dang Hyang dislikes Ken Arok’s decision. Because deplore (dislike) is one type of expressive speech act. We can see it from **Hanya saja aku tak pantas memberimu izin. Karena itu, bukan tindakan seorang pendeta. Batasnya adalah kehendak sendiri.**

4. Directive

- ✓ Raja Jaya Katog, “*Putraku Arsa Wijaya, hendaknya engkau ikut bermain tusuk-menusuk. Kami ingin melihat menteri-menteri kami yang akan menjadi lawanmu,*” (King Jaya Katog, “My son Arsa Wijaya, you should join fighting practice. We want to see how you fight our ministers)

Jawab Raden Wijaya, “*Baiklah, tuanku.*” (Raden Wijaya answered, “yes, sure”.

Explanation: The speaker is Raja Jaya Katong and the listener is Raden Wijaya. Raja Jaya Katong gave order to Raden Wijaya to follow archery competition. The situation happens in Daha’s palace when all of ministers in Daha join this competition. It shows that Raden Wijaya is struggle more than them. This scene is directive speech act, especially command or ordering.

✓ Speech act – illocutionary – Directive – **Prohibiting**

Sora berkata, “*Jangan, tuan*. Bukankah adik tuan yang tua telah tuan temukan?” (Sora said, “No, Sir. You have found your elderly brother, haven’t you?”)

Explanation: Directive of illocutionary act explains about something that someone wants to do something, and the statement is about prohibition of someone to do something.

✓ Speech act – illocutionary – Directive – **Suggestion**

Maka Sora berkata lagi, “*Lebih baik* tuanku mundur saja.”

Explanation: The statement includes directive because it is Sora **suggested** Tuan to go back.

✓ Kedua bangsawan itu berkata, “Wahai Dang Hyang, bukankah kami ini tidak berdosa?”

Sang Brahmana menjawab, “*Lebih baik tuan bersembunyi dahulu*.” (the two knights said, “Mr Dang Hyang, we didn’t make mistake, did we”. Brahmana answered, “you’d better hid your selves”)

= **suggestion**

Explanation: The setting is when the two knights are given information about the king Apanji Tohjaya command to kill them. Then Brahmana who knows that the two knights didn’t do any mistake, try to help the two knights by giving them a suggestion.

The conversation above shows the acts of giving advice contained in a sentences underlined. Brahmana gives suggestion to the two knights to hid first from Lembu Ampal who is ordered to kill them.

✓ “*Lebih baik* tuan berbicara dengan Ibu tuan.” kata pengasuh. (“you’d better talk to your mother,” maid said.)

Explanation: The statement includes directive illocutionary because it is about someone **suggests to do** something.

✓ Menjawablah sang Bango Samparan “Baiklah kalau demikian,

aku memberimu izin bahwa engkau akan menusukkan keris kepada Tunggul Ametung dan mengambil istrinya itu. Namun, hanya saja Arok, Akuwu itu sakti. Mungkin tidak dapat terluka jika engkau tusuk dengan keris yang bertuah. Aku mempunyai teman, seorang pandai keris diLulumbang bernama Empu Gading. Keris buatanya dikenal dengan bertuah tidak ada orang sakti yang meragukan kemampuan keris buatanya. Tak perlu dua kali jika ditusukkan. **Hendaknya engkau menyuruh membuat keris kepadanya. Jika keris itu sudah selesai dengan itulah hendaknya engkau membunuh Tunggul Ametung secara rahasia.** Demikian pesan Bango Samparan kepada Ken Arok.

Explanation: In this bold statement, Bango Samparan suggest Ken Arok to ask Empu Gandring make *Keris*, it is **suggestion**.

- ✓ Kata kepala lingkungan, “Nak, datanglah engkau ke asramaku kalau engkau lapar. Mintalah nasi setiap hari. Aku setiap hari memang mengharap ada tamu datang” (The master said, “Son, you may come to my dormitory, take the meal by yourself as I expect that everybody comes to my dorm everyday”)

Explanation: There is someone named Mpu Palot. He is the chief of the surroundings in Turyantapada. When Mpu Palot knows that Ken Arok is the one who took his foods every day, Mpu Palot then invites Ken Arok to come to his house to get some foods instead of taking someone else food without any permission. That’s why the utterance is included into directive illocutionary. (Mpu Palot helping Ken Arok without knowing his name.) = **request**

- ✓ Kata Ken Arok kepada Mpu Palot, “Wahai, hendak pergi ke manakah tuan ini?” (Ken Arok said to Mpu Palot, “Hey, where are you going.”)

Explanation: Mpu Palot was on the way to come home from Kabalon, he brought some material to make gold. He was afraid about someone named Ken Arok who always do robbery in the street. Mpu Palot didn’t know that Ken Arok is the man that he help after he took his foods (Mpu Palot helping Ken Arok without knowing his name). After that Mpu Palot met Ken Arok in the

rest Area. Then, Ken Arok asked Mpu Palot where he will go. The utterance can be categorized into directive illocutionary, because **asking** is part of directive illocutionary.

- ✓ Lalu ia berkata, “Sora, *marilah mendesak* dan mengamuk lagi agar dapat bertemu dengan puteri yang muda.” (He said, “Sora, let’s attack and raid that we can see young princess again.”)

Explanation: The utterance is included into directive illocutionary because the kind of the utterance is inviting. While inviting is part of directive illocutionary. it is a **request**.

- ✓ Kata Sora, “Sekarang ini, tuan *hendaknya* menyerang. Sekarang adalah kesempatan yang baik.” (Sora said, “It’s the time to attack. It’s a good time.”)

Explanation: The statement includes directive because it explains about Sora’s argument to Tuan to do something. = **command**

- ✓ Kata penguasa daerah kepada Ken Arok, “Nak, pergilah engkau. Jangan sampai para pengejarmu itu kembali. Kalau mereka membicarakan perkataanku tadi, akan sia-sia engkau berlindung kepadaku. Pergilah ke hutan.” (The chief said to Ken Arok, “Guy, you shall go. They will come after you. I could not help you. Go to the jungle)

Explanation: From the utterance, it can be categorized into directive illocutionary, because the chief of the village gives Ken Arok a suggestion to go and hide to the woods. So that, the villager who wants to catch Ken Arok, can not find him anymore. = **suggestion**

- ✓ Dewa Brahma mengenakan perjanjian dan perintah kepada Ken Endok, “Jangan engkau tidur dengan suamimu lagi, kalau engkau tidur dengannya niscaya suamimu akan mati, dan Anakku akan tercampur olehnya, Ketahuilah, nama anakku adalah Ken Arok, kelak dialah yang akan memimpin tanah jawa” (Brahma made an agreement and command to Ken Endok, “Don’t sleep with your husband anymore, or else he will die. You shall notice that my son named Ken Arok, he will lead Java then.”)

Explanation: this conversation includes **Directive**, directive is speech act used to get someone else to do something, for example say **command**, request, suggestion and etc. in the conversation the context occurs between Dewa Brahma and Ken Endok. Dewa Brahma command and make a deal with Ken Endok not to sleep with her husband anymore, because if Ken Endok sleep with her husband, her husband will die.

- ✓ Kata sang guru, “Jika sudah masak buah jambu itu, maka petiklah” (The teacher said, “If the fruit is ripe, just pick it.”)

Explanation: This conversation includes **Directive**. The conversation is about between Teacher and students. The teacher has a guava tree and the guava tree cannot be picked by everyone. Ken Arok becomes embittered with the guava fruits, in the night when Ken Arok sleep, there are so many bats out, the bats eat all of guava fruit, the teachers become angry with Ken Arok and then Ken Arok expelled by the teacher. When Ken Arok leave there is a shine inside Ken Arok then the teacher so shocked and then the teacher cannot expel Ken Arok. Finally the teacher gives command to all of students to get the fruit if the fruit is ripened.

- ✓ Keesokan harinya sang guru menyuruh Ken Arok untuk mengambil buah jambu. Ini membuat Ken Arok senang dan berkata “Aku mengharap semoga aku menjadi orang, aku akan membalas budi pada guru” (In the morning the teacher asked Ken Arok to pick the fruit that made him happy and said, “I hope I could be successful and pay good deed.”)

Explanation: This conversation included as **Directive**. This conversation is between Teachers and Ken Arok. The teachers ask or orders Ken Arok to get the guava fruit in the hall. Ken Arok becomes happy and wants to repay to the teachers.

From the analyze above we find four illocutionary speech acts, they are commissive, representative, expressive and directive. In directive speech acts we find that suggestion is the most dominant in the book “*Paparaton: Legenda Ken Arok Dan Ken Dedes*”.

When we ask next who else had interests involved in this text, the

origin and function of the story are indissolubly tied up with the form and history of the text. The book owes its chronicle-like character to its framework as an annotated genealogy of the kings of Majapahit and those surrounding them. As a sacred covenant between the ruling king, his people and the upper world (Ras, 1986), it was a story that needed to be regularly adjusted and brought up to date. Careful analysis enables us to reconstruct the development of the story and to appropriately interpret the information it offers.

From the findings above, the research concludes that the speech acts have been used to serve several functions in accommodating speaker's beliefs, feelings and desires. Factually, forces of comments delivered by the speakers pointing to the topic about life and struggles at Majapahit era. It was deduced from analyses of head acts and supportive moves to determine variations of speech acts. The presentation was established by the realizations of the four categories of speech acts which were found (commissive, representative, expressive, and directives). Specifically, the presentation was directly stated by direct indirect speech acts. It can be, among other examples, in form of direct order or asking and indirect advice stated in the conversation. In addition, the conversation participants provide reasons in form of beliefs to encourage a reasonableness of the blaming/complaint/critique or even an urgency of the order/asking/advice.

In fact, the study of Javanese literature still has a long way to go. This text need to be read and translated, but this by itself will not be enough. The works that make up Javanese literature also need to be placed within a wider framework, both the framework of history and that of the achievements of Javanese culture as a whole. It is a question of perspective. The significance of the part is only fully appreciated when it is seen in the company of its fellow-parts making up the sum-total. So two basic assumptions to be found here are, firstly, that it is possible to view Javanese literature as developing and changing over a certain period of time, and, secondly, that it is useful to see this process against the background of the culture of which, after all, literature is only one expression.

Ken Arok is not the only series to promote nationalism by invoking a glorious pre-colonial Indonesia. In addition to the Majapahit empire, Sriwijaya was another big kingdom associated with early Indonesia. Bumi Sriwijaya was as one of the world's great ancient empires, alongside those of Rome, Greece, Egypt, China, and India, and the blurb compares the first king, Sri Jayanasa, to Julius Caesar and Genghis Khan. Bumi Sriwijaya

followed the great steps of Dapunta Hyang Sri Jayanasa, who lived long before Majapahit, in the seventh century. Dapunta Hyang Sri Jayanasa is also represented as caring and charismatic, a sincere person who listens to and understands his rakyat, his people. Sriwijaya was once believed to have a great influence throughout Indonesia, Singapore, Thailand, and Cambodia today. Unsurprisingly, adventure novels that explore Indonesia's exalted past play fast and loose with historical facts and research.

Compartmentalization is often misleading: as a corrective this study will stress meeting, not only of genres and periods but more especially of cultures. It should be stressed that the story has not grown up in a vacuum, but in constant interaction with other areas of studies both within the Archipelago and beyond. In particular, influences have reached story from Java, resulting in certain changes in Java and all cultures. But at the same time we should not neglect the likelihood of influences coming from another direction, namely China. We have to discover how such influences reached Java, at what time, and with what effects. The 14th and 15th centuries saw in Java a remarkable prosperity, and also remarkable changes; externally Java stood at a crossroads in international trade, and internally at the cross-roads between Hinduism and Islam.

D. CONCLUSION

In relation to the goal of this study, the types of Speech Acts by Searle namely representative, Expressive, Commissive and Directive found in "*Paparaton: Legenda Ken Arok dan Ken Dedes*". The conversation used in the communication and ran in various manner. Directive is the most dominant found in the story. The functions of Speech Acts found in book functions to express thanking, requesting, declaring, and describing performing act. Suggestion in relation to the conclusions above are that this study can give contribution in study of linguistics especially Pragmatics and Sociolinguistics particularly Speech Acts. The students who have study in applied linguistics it is better for them to enrich their knowledge in communication by using Speech Acts and it is suggested for them to analyze the theory of Speech Acts widely in order to make a further research about Speech Acts. Other researchers who want to do the similar research should focus the attention to Speech Acts in some communication so that they could get fuller understanding.

"*Paparaton: Legenda Ken Arok Dan Ken Dedes*" contains many interesting and memorable dialogues that can be categorized as the directive speech acts. Based on the data analysis, the total of the classification of

illocutionary speech acts according Searle are 39 speech acts. The result of analysis shows that there are 9 commissive of illocutionary speech acts (23%). There are 9 representatives of illocutionary speech acts (23%). There are 7 expressive of illocutionary speech acts (18%). There are 14 directives illocutionary speech acts (38%). The researcher do not find declaration illocutionary speech act in this book.

Endnote:

* IAIN Surakarta email: santosabudi21@gmail.com

Bibliography

Austin, John. (1962). *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press.

Aziz, E.A. (2000). *Indonesian Speech Act Realisation in Face-threatening Situations*. Published in Monash University Linguistic Paper (MULP).

Bach, Kent and Robert M. Harnish (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Berg, C. C, 1938, 'Javaansche Geschiedschrijving', in: F. W. Stapel, *Geschiedenis van Nederlandsch Indie*, 2, Amsterdam.

—, 195 1, 'De evolutie der Javaanse geschiedschrijving', *Mededelingen der Kon. Academie v. Wetensch., Afd. Letterk., New Series*, vol. 14, no. 2, Amsterdam.

Brandes, J. L. A., 1897V19202, *Pararaton (Ken Arok) of het Boek der Koningen van Tumapel en van Majapahit*, VBG 49.1, Batavia/'s-Gravenhage.

—, 1904, *Nagarakretagama, Lofdigt van Prapanjtja op koning Radjasanagara, Hajam Wuruk, van Madjapahit*, VBG 54.1, Batavia/'s-Gravenhag

Djajadiningrat, Hoesein, 1913, *Critische Beschouwing van de Sadjarah Banten*, Haarle

- Iman Santoso, Eva Tuckyta Sari Sujatna, Sutiono Mahdi. 2014. "SPEECH ACT ON SHORT STORIES; A PRAGMATIC STUDY". Journal. Bandung: Padjadjaran University.
- Kadek Padma. 2012. "Serat Pararaton atau Kitab Pararaton" (online), (<http://sejarahdinusantara.blogspot.co.id/2012/06/serat-pararaton-atau-kitab-pararaton.html>), accessed on July 18, 2016).
- Keylli Kristani. 2012. "AN ANALYSIS OF DIRECTIVE SPEECH ACTS IN THE MOVIE "SLEEPING BEAUTY". Journal. Jakarta: Binus University.
- Lasantha.2012."Kitab Paparaton" (online), (<http://kekunaan.blogspot.co.id/2013/01/kitab-pararaton.html>), accessed on July 18, 2016).
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman Linguistic Library.
- Merriam Webster's Creative. "Dialogue" (online), (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/dialogue>), accessed on July 18, 2016).
- Ras, J. J., 1986a, "The Babad Tanah Jawi and its reliability; Questions of content, structure and function', in: C. D. Grijns and S. O. Robson, Cultural Contact and Textual Interpretation.
- Searle, John (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, Jenny. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.